

## REMARKS

The Amendment and these remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action mailed May 16, 2003, which has been received and carefully analyzed. Claims 1-29 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 22, and 26 are independent. No new claims have been added. Applicants consider Claims 1-29 in condition for allowance and request entry of the amendments and remarks and further request reconsideration of the application in light of the remarks herein. No new matter has been added. Claims 1 through 29 remain in this application. Claims 30-38 were previously withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. The Examiner has acknowledged that claims 27 and 29 are directed to allowable subject matter.

### SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by McWhorter et al. The present invention, as identified by claims 1-3 and 8, is not clearly anticipated by McWhorter because the carriage assembly of McWhorter is positioned both above and below the platform. The carriage assembly of the present invention is completely located below the platform, "positioned on the underside of the platform." See Claim 1. McWhorter includes upper legs 38 and rollers 42 positioned above the platform. The positioning of McWhorter causes the upper roller 42 to interfere with the anchors on the deck, and therefore, McWhorter fails to achieve one advantage of the claimed structure. This difference distinguishes the present invention from McWhorter, making Claim 1 and all relevant dependent claims allowable over McWhorter.

### SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 4-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McWhorter in view of Ballard. As described above, McWhorter includes a portion of the carriage assembly located above the platform, distinguishing the present invention from McWhorter. Ballard, likewise, includes portions of the carriage assembly above the platform. The combination of Ballard and McWhorter would not produce the present invention as claimed in Claims 4-18.

Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McWhorter in view of Mingardi. As discussed above, the present invention is distinguished from McWhorter and therefore any combination of McWhorter and Mingardi would not produce the present invention.

#### ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's objections to Claims 27 and 29 being dependent upon a rejected base claim and have rewritten Claims 27 and 29 in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.


#### Conclusion

Entry of the above amendment is respectfully requested. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 11-0106 additional fees due, if any, in connection with this amendment.

In view of the foregoing, consideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Further, a Notice of Allowance appears to be in order and such is courteously solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns about the allowability of this application, or if another action could be taken to further advance this application such as an Examiner's amendment, Applicants request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss them.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 16, 2003



---

Ashley N. Udden  
Registration No. 53,709  
BLACKWELL SANDERS PEPER MARTIN LLP  
2300 Main Street, Suite 1000  
Kansas City, MO 64108  
(816) 983-8000

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS